



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,253	01/28/2004	Clifford H. Ray	021120.0040.000	4153

7590 01/25/2008  
Mark A. Tidwell  
Jackson Walker L.L.P.  
Suite 2100  
112 E. Pecan Street  
San Antonio, TX 78205-1521

EXAMINER
----------

HUGHES, SCOTT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/766,253	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SCOTT A. HUGHES	<b>Art Unit</b> 3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29,69-71,91,92 and 109 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18,69-71,91 and 92 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,19-29 and 109 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2007 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the Agre reference does not teach a device for recording seismic signals detected by seismic sensors. Applicant argues that Agre specifically does not teach a seismic data recorder. This argument is not persuasive because Agre teaches that the signals recorded by the seismic sensors inside the housing are stored on memories inside of the housing (Column 5, Figs. 3-4). Applicant's arguments directed to the memory 21 are moot, as this is not the only memory described inside of the device of Agre, and memory element 16 described in Agre more closely reads upon applicant's claim limitations. In view of applicant's arguments, Agre discloses that element 16 is a buffer memory that stores the data from the sensors for processing (Column 5, Lines 10-45). This buffer memory 16 is coupled to the geophones through

the ADC, as seen in Figs. 3-4. The claim limitation requires that there be a seismic data recorder coupled to the geophone that permits signals detected by the geophone to be recorded on the seismic data recorder. Agre discloses a seismic data recorder 16 (buffer memory is disclosed to store the signals from the geophones, and therefore records the signals from the geophones in the memory for at least some period of time) that is coupled to the geophone, and discloses that this coupling permits the signals from the geophones to be stored in the seismic data recorder. Applicant's limitation of "seismic data recorder" is a broad limitation, and any device that stores or records the seismic for any period of time is a seismic data recorder.

Applicant's arguments there is no teaching in Agre that the device therein is capable of recording the large amounts of seismic data to be "collected" and recorded by the device of claims 1 and 9 is not persuasive. Applicant has not specified any amount of data to be collected in the claims, and this argument is further directed to the intended use of the apparatus claimed. Because the claim is an apparatus claim, the intended use argued by applicant is not part of the structural limitations that must be met by the prior art. Applicant's arguments directed to the use of the structure to collect large amounts of seismic data are not persuasive because this feature is not part of the structural limitations claimed.

With respect to claim 20, applicant's arguments are not persuasive because the Wood reference teaches that geophone sensing devices can be used over a survey area to collect seismic data for modeling a subsurface. As the Agre references teaches geophone units placed onto a terrain, it is obvious from Wood that these sensors could

be used to collect seismic data for modeling the subsurface beneath the sensors, and doing so would require GPS position data as taught by Wood. The modification of the device in Agre by the teachings in Wood shows the necessity for positional information from a GPS.

Applicant's arguments directed to new claim 109 are moot in view of the grounds of rejection presented below. Claim 109 is directed to non-elected species of 3 geophones. In the alternative, if applicant believes that the three component geophone claimed in claim 109 is distinct from the described embodiment using three geophones (non-elected embodiment), then the claim introduces new matter that is not described in the specification in the form of the use of one geophone (elected species) that is a three component geophone. For the purpose of this action, the limitation in claim 109 will be treated as though it requires one three component geophone, and will be treated as being distinct from the non-elected embodiment of three geophones arranged at angles to each other described in the specification.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 11 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 109 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 109 recites the limitation of at least one three component geophone. The specification describes the use of three geophones arranged at angles to each other, but does not describe the use of one three component geophone internally fixed within the housing.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-15, 19, 21, 26-27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Agre (6208247).

With regard to claim 1, Agre discloses a land based seismic data collection unit (abstract; Column 3) (Figs .1-4). Agre discloses a non-spherical, fully enclosed case

Art Unit: 3663

formed of a single housing, the case having a wall defining an internal compartment within the housing (Fig. 1) (Column 2, Line 30 to Column 4, Line 21; Column 4, Line 62 to Column 5, Line 10). Agre discloses at least one geophone internally fixed within the housing (Figs. 1-3) (Column 4, Line 62 to Column 6, Line 68). Agre discloses a clock disposed within the housing (Columns 5-6; Column 7, Lines 27-54; Columns 9-10). Agre discloses a power source 3 disposed within the housing (Fig. 1) (Column 4, Lines 60-67). Agre discloses a seismic data recorder 16,21 disposed within the housing (Figs. 3-4) (Column 5, Line 18 to Column 6, line 20; Columns 7-10). Agre discloses that each of the elements b-e includes an electrical connection and all electrical connections between any elements are contained within the housing (Figs. 1-4) (Column 2, Line 30 to Column 4, Line 21; Column 4, Line 62 to Column 10). Agre discloses that all of the electronics working together are connected together inside of the case. Agre discloses that the geophone is coupled to the seismic data recorded to permit seismic signals detected by the geophones to be recorded on the seismic data recorder (Column 5, Lines 10-45) (Figs. 3-4).

With regard to claim 2, Agre discloses that the unit is self-contained and requires no external communications or controls during recording (Columns 2-4) (Figs. 1-2).

With regard to claim 4, Agre discloses that the case comprises a first plate (top) having a first periphery and a second plate (bottom) having a second periphery, wherein the plates are joined along their peripheries by the wall (Fig. 1) (Column 4, Line 50 to Column 5, Line 10).

With regard to claim 5, Agre discloses that the case is defined by at least one substantially flat wall (sides of case) (Fig. 1).

With regard to claim 6, Agre discloses that the geophone is disposed adjacent to the flat wall (Figs. 1-3) (geophone is part of electronics which are adjacent to the wall).

With regard to claim 7, Agre discloses that the case is defined by at least one plate (top and bottom of housing) (Fig. 1).

With regard to claim 8, Agre discloses that the geophone is disposed adjacent to the plate (Figs. 1-3) (geophone is part of electronics which are adjacent to the plate).

With regard to claim 9, Agre discloses a land based seismic data collection unit (abstract; Column 3) (Figs. 1-4). Agre discloses a non-spherical, fully enclosed case formed of a single housing, the case having a wall defining an internal compartment within the housing (Fig. 1) (Column 2, Line 30 to Column 4, Line 21; Column 4, Line 62 to Column 5, Line 10). Agre discloses at least one geophone internally fixed within the housing (Figs. 1-3) (Column 4, Line 62 to Column 6, Line 68). Agre discloses a clock disposed within the housing (Columns 5-6; Column 7, Lines 27-54; Columns 9-10). Agre discloses a power source 3 (Fig. 1) (Column 4, Lines 60-67). Agre discloses a seismic data recorder 16,21 disposed within the housing (Figs. 3-4) (Column 5, Line 18 to Column 6, line 20; Columns 7-10). Agre discloses that each of the elements b-e includes an electrical connection and all electrical connections between any elements are contained within the housing (Figs. 1-4) (Column 2, Line 30 to Column 4, Line 21; Column 4, Line 62 to Column 10). Agre discloses that all of the electronics working together are connected together inside of the case. Agre discloses that the geophone is



coupled to the seismic data recorded to permit seismic signals detected by the geophones to be recorded on the seismic data recorder (Column 5, Lines 10-45) (Figs. 3-4).

With regard to claim 10, Agre discloses that the unit is self-contained and requires no external communications or controls during recording (Columns 2-4) (Figs. 1-2).

With regard to claim 11, Agre discloses that the power source is disposed within the case (Fig. 1) Column 4, Lines 60-67).

With regard to claims 14 and 15, Agre discloses that the wall is not spherical or hemispherical (Fig. 1)

With regard to claim 19, Agre discloses a tilt meter disposed within the case (Column 3, Column 6) (magnetic and acceleration sensors can be used to sense tilt).

With regard to claim 21, Agre discloses a radio unit 4 (Figs. 1-4) (Columns 2-3, Column 4, Line 61 to Column 5, Line 10, Columns 10-11).

With regard to claim 26, Agre discloses a radio frequency identification 4 (Figs. 1-4) (Columns 2-3, Column 4, Line 61 to Column 5, Line 10, Columns 10-11).

With regard to claim 27, Agre discloses that the power source provides all power to the unit while deployed (Column 2, Lines 56-67; to Column 4, Lines 64-67).

With regard to claim 29, Agre discloses an internal control mechanism for controlling all functions of the unit while deployed (Figs. 3-4) (Column 5, Line 18 to Column 6, line 20; Columns 7-10).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre.

With regard to claim 3, Agre does not disclose that the case is watertight. Agre discloses that the device can be dropped from a ship (Columns 2-3), but does not state that this device is waterproof. It would be obvious that a device dropped from a ship (into water) would be waterproof in order to avoid having the electronics in the device short out rendering the device useless.

Claims 16-17 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-15, 19, 21, 26-27, and 29 above, and further in view of Orban (6353577).

With regard to claim 16, Agre discloses that the case defines an external surface, but does not disclose that the external surface is provided with ridges to enhance coupling of the unit with the earth. Agre discloses that the seismic sensors are placed in a survey area, but does not disclose the coupling that they have with the ground. Orban teaches that seismic sensors can be coupled to the earth to sense seismic signals while being fixed inside of the housing of the device containing the geophone

(Figs. 1, 4, 6-7) (Columns 3-6). Orban teaches that the surface of the case that contains the geophones and electronics can have ridges that enhance coupling of the unit to the earth (Column 6, Lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to include ridges as taught by Orban in order to couple the device to the ground to enhance coupling and limit noise in the received signals.

With regard to claim 17, Orban teaches that the case defines an external surface and that the external surface is provided with at least one spike 64 (Figs. 6-7) to enhance coupling with the earth (Column 6, Lines 1-25).

With regard to claim 24, Agre does not disclose an external connector in electrical communication with the geophone, the connector extending through the wall of the case and disposed within the wall so as to be set in from the external surface of the wall. Agre discloses that the unit communicates via radio antenna, but does not disclose an external connector. Orban teaches using an external connector 22 in electrical communication with geophones in a housing, the connector being set in the surface of the casing (Figs. 4-7) (Column 3, Lines 29-55; Column 5, Line 60 to Column 6, Line 25). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to include an external connector as taught by Orban in order to allow the geophone unit to connect to other geophone units in the area to form a seismic network.

With regard to claim 25, Orban teaches a water tight, pressure resistant cap disposed over the external connector (Figs. 4-7) (Column 3, Lines 29-55; Column 5, Line 60 to Column 6, Line 25). The connection must be watertight or else the electronic control package and geophones would not function.

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-15, 19, 21, 26-27, and 29 above, and further in view of Harmon.

With regard to claim 12, Agre does not disclose that that power source includes a fuel cell attached to the case. Agre discloses batteries as the power source. Harmon discloses that fuel cells are an alternative to batteries and that they can be used as an external power source attached to a device (Column 6, Lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to use a fuel cell instead of a battery as a power source in order to have a longer lasting source of power.

With regard to claim 13, Agre does not disclose that the power source includes a solar cell attached to the case. Agre discloses batteries as the power source. Harmon discloses that solar cells are an alternative to batteries and that they can be used as an external power source attached to a device (Column 6, Lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to use a solar cell instead of a battery as a power source in order to have a renewable power source that is easily rechargeable.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-15, 19, 21, 26-27, and 29 above, and further in view of Wood.

With regard to claim 20, Agre does not disclose a GPS location transducer. Wood discloses that GPS receivers are used with geophones to determine the position

Art Unit: 3663

from which the seismic data was recorded (abstract). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to use GPS so that the device could be located and the data it obtains matched to its position after its deployment to the surface of the earth.

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-15, 19, 21, 26-27, and 29 above, and further in view of Sternberg.

With regard to claim 22, Agre does not disclose that the clock is a crystal clock. Sternberg discloses the use of crystal clocks in a seismic recording system (Column 6, Lines 33-52). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to include a crystal clock as disclosed by Sternberg in order to have a stable clock in order to maintain timing accuracy.

With regard to claim 23, Agre does not disclose that the clock is a rubidium clock. Sternberg discloses the use of rubidium clocks in a seismic recording system (Column 6, Lines 33-52). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to include a rubidium clock as disclosed by Sternberg in order to have a stable clock in order to maintain timing accuracy.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-15, 19, 21, 26-27, and 29 above and further in view of Donoho.

With regard to claim 28, Agre discloses that the power source is a battery (Column 2, Lines 56-67; to Column 4, Lines 64-67). Donoho teaches that lithium-ion batteries are used in seismic data acquisition units containing geophones (Column 6, Lines 39-48), and therefore it would have been obvious to use a lithium-ion battery in Agre in order to have a reliable power source that does not need to be recharged.

Claim 109 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agre ( ) in view of Orban (6353577).

With regard to claim 109, Agre discloses a land based seismic data collection unit (abstract; Column 3) (Figs. 1-4). Agre discloses a non-spherical, fully enclosed case formed of a single housing, the case having a wall defining an internal compartment within the housing (Fig. 1) (Column 2, Line 30 to Column 4, Line 21; Column 4, Line 62 to Column 5, Line 10). Agre discloses at least one geophone internally fixed within the housing (Figs. 1-3) (Column 4, Line 62 to Column 6, Line 68). Agre discloses a clock disposed within the housing (Columns 5-6; Column 7, Lines 27-54; Columns 9-10). Agre discloses a power source 3 disposed within the housing (Fig. 1) (Column 4, Lines 60-67). Agre discloses a seismic data recorder 16,21 disposed within the housing (Figs. 3-4) (Column 5, Line 18 to Column 6, line 20; Columns 7-10). Agre discloses that each of the elements b-e includes an electrical connection and all electrical connections between any elements are contained within the housing (Figs. 1-4) (Column 2, Line 30 to Column 4, Line 21; Column 4, Line 62 to Column 10). Agre discloses that all of the electronics working together are connected together inside of

Art Unit: 3663

the case. Agre does not disclose that the geophone is a three component geophone, and does not disclose positional and orientation electronics disposed within the housing. Orban teaches the use of a housing containing seismic sensors, processors, and circuitry used to collect seismic data (abstract; Columns 1-2). Orban teaches that use of three component sensors for sensing seismic data, and teaches orientation and positioning electronics (electronics that determine position and orientation from acceleration due to gravity signals and magnetometer signals) inside of a case with the seismic sensors and processors (Figs. 1, 3, 4) (Column 4, Line 57 to Column 6, Line 7). It would have been obvious to modify Agre to include a three component geophone and position and orientation circuitry as taught by Orban in order to conduct seismic surveys of the land under the sensors and to correct the data obtained for the orientation of the sensor at each sensor position.

### ***Conclusion***

The cited prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott A. Hughes whose telephone number is 571-272-6983. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on (571) 272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAH

/Jack W. Keith/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663